

REMARKS

This is a Response to the Office Action mailed March 12, 2009, in which a three (3) month Shortened Statutory Period for Response has been set, due to expire June 12, 2009. Claims 16-18 have been canceled. Claims 1, 2, 14, 15 and 19 have been amended. No new matter has been added to the application. The Director is authorized to charge any additional fees due by way of this Amendment, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 19-1090. Claims 1-15, 19 and 20 are pending.

Allowed Claims

The Office Action stated that claims 10-13¹ are allowed. Applicants thank the Examiner for the allowance of claims 10-13.

Allowable Claims

The Office Action indicated that claims 1-9, 15, and 19-20 include allowable subject matter. In particular, the Office Action indicated that claim 1 would be allowable if amended to overcome objections described below; that claim 15 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of its base claim; and that claim 19 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claim and to overcome objections described below.

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating the allowability of claims 1-9, 15, 19 and 20. For at least the reasons provided below, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 and amended claim 19 are now in condition for allowance.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-9 and 16-20 were objected to for containing informalities.

¹ The Office Action indicated that claim 14 was also allowed. Applicant believes that the indicated allowance of claim 14 was a typographical error because claim 14 depends indirectly from claim 1, which was objected to. For at least the reasons given below, Applicant submits that claim 1 and its dependent claims are now in condition for allowance.

Claims 1 and 2 have been amended in the manner suggested by the Examiner. In particular, claim 1 was amended to recite “is calibrated to be operatively functional” and to delete the phrase “that is exterior to the SIM card.” Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to claim 1 overcome the objection, and therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is now in condition for allowance.

Claim 2 has been amended to insert a period (“.”) at the end of the claim. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to claim 2 be withdrawn.

Claim 16 was objected to for having the same informalities as claim 1. Claim 16 has been cancelled. However, claim 19 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 16 in accordance with the Examiner’s suggested amendments. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 19 does not include objected to subject matter of claim 16.

Claims 15 and 18 were objected to for reciting “no other memory.” The Examiner suggested amending the aforementioned claims to recite “on other non-volatile memory.” Claim 15 has been amended in the manner suggested by the Examiner.

Claim 18 has been cancelled. However, claim 19 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 18 in accordance with the Examiner’s suggested amendment. In particular, amended claim 19 recites, *inter alia*, “wherein the mobile terminal includes the first memory device and the second memory device and no other non-volatile memory device.” Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 19 does not include objected to subject matter of claim 18.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

Claims 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, because claim 18 recited “no other memory.” Claims 19 and 20 were rejected to for depending from claim 18. Applicants have cancelled claim 18. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 18-20 be withdrawn.

Amendments to Claims 1, 14 and 19

As described above, claim 1 has been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 14, which previously recited "the mobile terminal ... does not require any other memory device," has been amended to recite "the mobile terminal ... does not require any other non-volatile memory device." Applicants believe that this amendment is in accordance with the Examiner's suggested amendments of claims 15 and 18.

Claim 19 has been amended to explicitly recite the limitations of claims 16-18 in accordance with the Examiner's aforementioned suggested amendments to claims 16 and 18. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 19 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 19 does not include the identical limitations of claim 17, which recited, *inter alia*, "wherein the mobile terminal ... does not require any other memory device." When adding the limitations of claim 17 into claim 19, the aforementioned limitation was changed such that claim 19 recites, *inter alia*, "the mobile terminal ... does not require any other non-volatile memory device." (See claim 19, sixth paragraph.)

In addition, claim 16 included a typographical error that has not been included in claim 19. In particular, claim 16 recited "a first memory device that is one of a read only memory (ROM) or **as** a Flash memory" (emphasis added). Claim 19 recites "a first memory device that is one of a read only memory (ROM) or a Flash memory."

All of the claims remaining in the application are now clearly allowable. Favorable consideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

SEED Intellectual Property Law Group PLLC

/Eric M. Ringer, Ph.D./

Eric M. Ringer, Ph.D.

Registration No. 47,028

EMR:wt
701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 5400
Seattle, Washington 98104
Phone: (206) 622-4900 Fax: (206) 682-6031
1380795_1.DOC